

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

ORACLE USA, INC., a Colorado corporation; )  
ORACLE AMERICA, INC., a Delaware )  
corporation; and ORACLE )  
INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION, a )  
California corporation, )

2:10-CV-00106-LRH-PAL

Plaintiffs, )

ORDER

v. )

RIMINI STREET, INC., a Nevada )  
corporation; SETH RAVIN, an individual, )

Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

Before the court is plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc.; Oracle America, Inc.; and Oracle International Corporation's (collectively "Oracle") motion to seal objections to a discovery order. Doc. #373.<sup>1</sup>

As an initial matter, the court is acutely cognizant of the presumption in favor of public access to papers filed in the district court. *See Hagestad v. Tragesser*, 49 F.3d 1430, 1434 (9th Cir. 1995). Therefore, a party seeking to file materials under seal bears the burden of overcoming that presumption by showing that the materials are covered by an operative protective order and are also deserving of confidentiality. *See Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135

---

<sup>1</sup>Refers to the court's docket entry number.

1 (9th Cir. 2005). Specifically, a party must “articulate compelling reasons supported by specific  
2 factual findings that outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring  
3 disclosure.” *Kamakana, City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir. 2006)  
4 (internal citations omitted).

5 Here, in this intellectual property action, the court has entered a protective order governing  
6 documentation and testimony that is confidential to the parties’ internal research and development.  
7 The court has reviewed the documents and pleadings on file in this matter and finds that documents  
8 at issue in the present motions contain information that is designated “Confidential” and “Highly  
9 Confidential” under the protective order. Therefore, the court finds that Oracle has satisfied its  
10 burden to show compelling reasons for filing the various pleadings under seal. Accordingly, the  
11 court shall grant Oracle’s motion.

12  
13 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiffs’ motion to seal (Doc. #373) is GRANTED.

14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 DATED this 2nd day of February, 2013.



16  
17  
18 LARRY R. HICKS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26